

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-47 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 4, 17, and 32. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are none. New claims added herein are none.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] The Examiner graciously met with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on August 23, 2007. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0005] During the interview, the Examiner and I discussed overcoming § 101 rejections and distinctions between the claims and the cited art. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0006] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals, and I understood the Examiner to tentatively indicate that additional proposed clarifying claim amendments would appear to be able to distinguish over the cited art of record. The Examiner indicated that upon receiving a formal response he would review the cited art and do another search.

[0007] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

[0008] Applicant submits that each claim amendment is supported by the originally filed Specification, at least as discussed during the interview, particularly the claim amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [0018], [0039], and [0228] of the Specification.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0009] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0010] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0011] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 17, and 32 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features in accordance with our discussion with the Examiners. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to cited prior art.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 101

[0012] Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims comply with the patentability requirements of § 101 and that the § 101 rejections should be withdrawn. The Applicant further asserts that these claims are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0013] If the Examiner maintains the rejection of these claims, then the Applicant requests additional guidance as to what is necessary to overcome the rejections.

Claim Rejections under § 102

[0014] The Examiner rejects claims 1-47 under §102. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not shown that cited reference anticipates the rejected claims.

[0015] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0016] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following reference: *Bent, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,463,442 (issued Oct 8, 2002).

Overview of the Application

[0017] The Application describes a technology implementing a data item having a data item property with an associated value and a user interface element having an element property with a value that can be defined by an association to the data item property. A binding definition associating the element property of the user interface element with the data item property such that an application program which generates a user interface for display can be developed independent of the data item, and such that the data item can be developed independent of display-related information corresponding to the user interface element.

[0018] In another implementation, an application program generates a user interface having a display element to display a representation of a data item. A data programming model associates a display element property of the display element with a data item property of the data item with a binding definition such that a value of the data item property is displayed as the representation of the data item.

Cited Reference

[0019] The cited reference describes a technology for a container independent data binding system that independently facilitates data binding by way of a binding agent object on behalf of any data consumer and/or data source that conforms to the necessary interfaces and protocols. The binding agent facilitates data binding and transparent data access for any visual and/or non-visual object, in addition to control data verification for client-side control validation independent of a container, binding collection for non-data aware objects that can benefit from data binding, data conversion and formatting to control User Interface displays in the context of data binding, and repeater control to facilitate a list view for visual objects, for any object that requires and requests access to these features rather than individually implementing these features without binding agent support.

Anticipation Rejections

[0020] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.¹ Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.²

¹ "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); also see MPEP §2131.

² See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

[0021] The Examiner rejects claims 1-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the cited reference. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims. Based on the reasons given below, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claims 1, 17 and 32

[0022] The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 3-4) the following with regard to claim 1:

With respect to claim 1, Bent teaches a data programming model (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

a data item having a data item property with an associated value (see, for example, data 250 in FIG. 3, and column 9, lines 8-14, which shows a data source or data item with a property and an associated value);

a user interface element having an element property with a value that can be defined by an association to the data item property (see, for example, display areas 210 and 220 in FIG. 3, and column 6, lines 32-36, which shows user interface elements that are data consumers, and see, for example, column 8, lines 44-49, which further shows the data consumer with a property that defines an association to the data source or data item property); and

a binding definition configured to associate the element property of the user interface element with the data item property such that an application program which generates a user interface for display can be developed independent of the data item, and such that the data item can be developed independent of display-related information corresponding to the user interface element (see, for example, column 7, lines 46-57, which shows a binding definition that associates the user interface element with the data source or data item, and see, for example, container applications 230 and 240 in FIG. 3, and column 6, lines 48-64, which shows that such application programs and the data source or data item are independently developed).

Original Dependent Claim 4

[0023] The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 4-5) the following with regard to this claim (now incorporated in claims 1, 17, and 32):

With respect to claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Bent further teaches a transform definition developed as a logic component of the application program, the transform definition configured to generate a transformed value of the data item property for association with the element property of the user interface element (see, for example, column 15, lines 27-34, which shows a format or transform definition to generate a formatted or transformed value for association with the user interface element, and column 16, lines 25-33, which further shows a format or transform definition developed as a component of the application program)

[0024] Applicant submits that the cited reference does not anticipate claims 1, 17 or 32 as amended at least because it does not show or disclose a “transform definition” as recited in those claims. For example, the cited reference does not disclose a “transform definition” with the following elements from claim 1:

- a transform definition developed as a logic component of the application program, the transform definition configured to generate a transformed value of the data item property for association with an element property of the user interface element by a binding definition, wherein **the transform definition is interjected in a data path** between the data item and the user interface, wherein the transform definition **changes how the data item value is displayed in the user interface**, and wherein **presentation of the data item is dependent upon the transform definition**, wherein the presentation characteristics are not integrated with the data item.

[0025] In this Action, the Examiner equates the format object disclosed by the cited reference with the “transform definition” recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0026] Unlike the “transform definition” of the claim, the system of the cited reference is not characterized as transformation logic defined by a developer of the application program “to change a data item property value into a new form, type, or value whenever the data item property value is transferred or referenced from the data item . . . to the user interface property,” [0019]. The formatting object of the cited reference is allowing an end user to set simple formats for accessed data. The format object of the cited reference does not provide for “[a]pplication-defined transform definitions [that] can be defined and attached to **any** binding that associates user interface element properties and data item properties,” (emphasis added [0020] *cf.* the cited reference, c. 15, ll. 35-49).

[0027] The cited reference merely discloses the end user’s ability to attach format objects to data consumer objects which will then control how data is represented when it is obtained via a query. The cited reference does not teach transform definitions having a context property or dependent on a culture as taught by the instant application, (*see at least* [0039] and [0228]).

[0028] In short, the cited reference does not anticipate claim 1 because it does not disclose or suggest a transformer for user interface element properties that are dependent but separate from data item properties, such that the same transformer can return different

results based on the dependent property input parameters available from a single data source.

[0029] Consequently, for at least the above reasons, the cited reference does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claims 1, 17, and 32. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims 2-16, 18-31, and 33-47

[0030] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claims 1, 17, and 32. As discussed above, claims 1, 17, and 32 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0031] For example, claim 4 as amended sets forth the following feature:

- wherein the **binding definition facilitates one-time binding** wherein a **user interface property is initialized from a data item property** and wherein the **user interface property does not update when changes are made to the data item property after the initialization**

[0032] In the above mentioned Examiner interview, the Examiner indicated that he believed the above feature was taught by the reference, citing "IPPropertyNotifySink" (c. 16, l. 41). However in the cited reference, there is no provision for making the binding "one-time." In other words, in the cited reference, there is no way to mark the binding as being one-time only—in the cited reference listening occurs for all new events. As

recited in this claim, "the binding definition facilitates one-time binding." The claim is directed to a way to turn listening off after one event, via binding. The cited reference does not teach or suggest such one-time binding.

Conclusion

[0033] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 09/05/2009

By: 

Bea Koempel-Thomas
Reg. No. 58213
(509) 324-9256 x259
bea@leehey.com
www.leehey.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehey.com